AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Please amend FIGS. 8-11 to include the legend "Prior Art" as indicated on the replacement sheets provided herewith.

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application, with claims 1 and 6 being independent. Claims 1 and 6 has been amended. Claim 9 has been added. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. Favorable reconsideration of the application in light of the following comments is respectfully solicited.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank Examiner Agustin for indicating that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawings

FIG. 8-11 were objected to for failing to include a legend "Prior Art." FIGS. 8-11 have been amended to overcome this objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claim Objection

Claim 1 was objected to for a minor informality. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that recitation "resultant" in claim 1, line 9 should be changed to "result." Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,683,833

("Dekker"). Applicants respectfully traverse the above-stated rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a repetitive control device that includes, among other features, a feedback signal system for sequentially updating and storing an output signal from the adder, and outputting the signal to the adder. The feedback signal system includes a filter which has, as a delay element, a memory which stores signal information for one rotation of a disc into divided plural memory areas of the memory, said filter being operated using a clock signal that is equal to an operation frequency of a driving signal, or a divided frequency thereof.

AAPA and Dekker, either alone or in combination, do not appear to describe or otherwise suggest a repetitive control device that includes, among other features, a feedback signal system including a filter which has, as a delay element, a memory which stores signal information for one rotation of a disc into divided plural memory areas of the memory, said filter being operated using a clock signal that is equal to an operation frequency of a ***driving signal***, or a divided frequency thereof, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action asserts that AAPA discloses this feature. *See e.g.*, Office Action at page 3, lines 22-24. Applicants disagree. As pointed out by the specification, the present invention is different from the conventional optical disc device described in AAPA in that the memory of the repetitive control device servers as a delay element for the filter, and further, the operation frequency of the memory is ***not equal to*** the memory address switching frequency ***but equal to*** the operation frequency of the driving signal or a division frequency thereof. *See e.g.*, Substitute Specification at page 18, lines 1-8.

Dekker does not appear to remedy the shortcomings of AAPA to describe or suggest a repetitive control device that includes, among other features, a feedback signal system including a filter which has, as a delay element, a memory which stores signal information for one rotation

of a disc into divided plural memory areas of the memory, said filter being operated using a clock signal that is equal to an operation frequency of a ***driving signal***, or a divided frequency thereof, as recited in claim 1.

Dekker, in FIG. 1, discloses a device for scanning a rotating information carrier (2). Dekker at col. 2, lines 28-29. The device includes, among other components, rotating means (4), rotation speed detecting means (8), a transducer (10), and control means (20). Dekker at col. 2, lines 30-60. The control means (20) includes a delay loop (25), which comprises combination means (34) and delay memory means (36). Dekker at col. 3, lines 17-25. The delay in the memory means (36) is proportional to a clock period of the clock signal (CL). Dekker at col. 3, lines 24-26.

As such, Dekker appears to describe memory means (36) that operates using a clock signal, but it does not appear to describe memory means using a clock signal that is equal to an operation frequency of a driving signal, or a divided frequency thereof. As such, Dekker does not appear to describe or suggest a repetitive control device that includes, among other features, a feedback signal system including a filter which has, as a delay element, a memory which stores signal information for one rotation of a disc into divided plural memory areas of the memory, said filter being operated using a clock signal that is equal to an operation frequency of a ***driving signal***, or a divided frequency thereof, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Office Action does not appear to rely on Dekker to illustrate such teachings.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and of its dependent claims. Claim 6 includes features similar to the above-recited features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented

above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 and of its dependent claims.

Dependent Claims

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because claim 1 is allowable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also allowable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication for which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Babak Akhlaghi
Limited Recognition No. L0250

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BA:MaM
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: October 29, 2008

Please recognize our Customer No. 53080 as our correspondence address.